UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/656,015	09/05/2003	Dianne Smith Phillips	G&C 30566.254-US-U1	8148
55895 GATES & CO	7590 10/22/2007	EXAMINER		
HOWARD HU	IGHES CENTER	AUGUSTINE, NICHOLAS		
6701 CENTER DRIVE WEST, SUITE 1050 LOS ANGELES, CA 90045			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	-,	·	2179	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/656,015	PHILLIPS ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Nicholas Augustine	2179	

Advisory Action	10/656,015	PHILLIPS ET AL.	
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nicholas Augustine	2179	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress /
THE REPLY FILED 09 October 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notal Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	wing replies: (1) an amendment, aff tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in o ce with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply mo	idavit, or other eviden compliance with 37 Cl	ce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I 	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP-7	(b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	FIRST REPLY WAS F	ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig r than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed <u>AMENDMENTS</u> 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to within the time period set forth in 3	avoid dismissal of th 37 CFR 41.37(a).	e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re		the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 	:		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s). 			_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		II be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1,3-8,10-15 and 17-21. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	d sufficient reasons why the affiday	vit or other evidence is	necessary and
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	ls to provide a l).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER			
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.		n condition for allowar	ice because:
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other: 	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s).		

.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The final rejection will be maintained; it is believed that the references cited discloses the claimed invention. Although the cited references use differing terminology than that of the immediate application it is believed that the functionality as taught by Clevenger in view of PTC and Clevenger in view of SkySof Software is the same functionality as taught by the immediate application in such that Clevenger teaches a three dimensional object being displayed on an object properties palette, wherein the current object being displayed has editing controls adjacent to the three dimensional object (pg. 121) which is separate from the main view of the application (pg.8). Clevenger also teaches a means of keynoting an objects properties, wherein a graphical indications are displayed to the user to indicate tools and effected elements/ properties of the three dimensional scene being created by the user (see page 230, column 2) wherein described "...The Object Attribute icons that appear next to an object's bounding box let you access different editors and set object attributes..." Clevenger clearly gives all the means necessary to provide object parameter keynotes with graphical indications to a three dimensional object. As for the teachings of PTC, it was to be understood that the combination of PTC into Clevenger was made for more supporting evidence that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a better graphical indication was depicted (PDF pg. 172). As taught by PTC are a bill of materials (or BOM) which is a list of components that make up an article (a listing of parts) which depicted on (PDF pg.172) is the graphical indication of using keynotes relating to the components that make up an article. This is believed to be the same functionality of a graphical object (as depicted on PDF pg.172; graphical object of an article) components are keynoted to provide to the user the indication of where components on an article are located. The combination of PTC into Clevenger would allow for one skilled in the art to see that the elements being keynoted as referenced from a list (PTC) on the same palette window (Clevenger). Therefore one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made would be able to see that combination of PTC into Clevenger teaches the use of keynotes in a property palette and keynoting properties that are displayed in a properties palette. Such that Clevenger teaches a properties palette with a 3D object displayed in the properties palette with a 'list' of associated properties (components which make up the object; branch/trunk. tree, foliage, etc) that when interacted with by the user causes the 3D object to change in display and PTC teaches a 'list' of components (parts of a 3D object which is related to the parts of the 3D object of Clevenger which can be changed by user interaction) that are keynoted with a 'list' of components to provide to the user an easy indication of where the components are located on a 3D object. Therefore as the current state of the claim language the final rejection will be maintained.